

Voting Exercise Results

General Obligation (GO) Bonds	Occupation Tax on Retail Sale of Gasoline	State Gasoline Tax	Vehicle Retail Sales Tax Receipts	Joint Transportation District	State Pays Match for South Beltway	Worker Tax
GO Bonds are bonds paid from City-wide property taxes; Issuance of GO Bonds requires a majority vote of the City electorate; GO Bonds are commonly used by cities to fund capital projects.	"Occupation tax" would be levied against businesses selling gasoline at the retail level; City has State authorization to level a tax on most occupations. <i>Examples calculated at 3 cents* and 5 cents# per gallon</i>	Recently proposed State legislation would increase State fuel tax by 2 cents with the resulting revenue going to Nebraska cities and counties.	Tax revenues received from the vehicle sales now goes into the City's General Fund; This option would gradually shift these funds to road construction; A replacement funding source would be needed.	Nebraska law allows two or more jurisdictions to set up a separate agency to "perform any governmental services;" A City-County District would be able to collect and spend tax funds for street and road construction.	The South Beltway is proposed to be paid for without any State funds; This option would ask the State to pay for the local match portion (20%) of the project – rather than the City of Lincoln.	An annual flat tax paid by all full time employees working in Lincoln. Additional research is needed to determine City's authority to levy such a tax. Unicameral action may be required.
Property Tax	Fuel Tax	Fuel Tax	Property Tax	Property Tax	State Funds	Employment
\$50 million	\$27 million*	\$25 million	\$25 million	\$30 million	\$30 million	\$25 million
ABLE 3 7.0%	ABLE 2 4.7%	ABLE 9 20.9%	ABLE 0 0.0%	ABLE 9 20.9%	ABLE 10 23.3%	ABLE -- 0.0%
Gere 2 0.8%	Gere 24 9.6%	Gere 23 9.2%	Gere 27 10.8%	Gere 42 16.9%	Gere 59 23.7%	Gere -- 0.0%
Anderson 13 8.5%	Anderson 7 4.6%	Anderson 13 8.5%	Anderson 4 2.6%	Anderson 9 5.9%	Anderson 14 9.2%	Anderson 68 44.4%
Eiseley 13 7.9%	Eiseley 7 4.2%	Eiseley 8 4.8%	Eiseley 11 6.7%	Eiseley 19 11.5%	Eiseley 32 19.4%	Eiseley 27 16.4%
Martin 0 0.0%	Martin 2 2.6%	Martin 5 6.5%	Martin 10 13.0%	Martin 5 6.5%	Martin 8 10.4%	Martin 12 15.6%
Walt 2 0.8%	Walt 14 5.8%	Walt 10 4.1%	Walt 11 4.6%	Walt 28 11.6%	Walt 25 10.4%	Walt 37 15.4%
LIBA 5 3.3%	LIBA 2 1.3%	LIBA 9 5.9%	LIBA 20 13.1%	LIBA 11 7.2%	LIBA 29 19.0%	LIBA 26 17.0%
TOTAL 38 3.5% (\$30 per year ¹)	TOTAL 58 5.4% (\$36 per year)	TOTAL 77 7.1% (\$24 per year)	TOTAL 83 7.7% (\$38 per year ¹)	TOTAL 123 11.4% (\$40 per year ¹)	TOTAL 177 16.4% (- - - -)	TOTAL 170 15.7% (\$30 per yr/per worker)
\$60 million	\$45 million*					
ABLE 4 9.3%	ABLE 1 2.3%					
Gere 6 2.4%	Gere 15 6.0%					
Anderson 10 6.5%	Anderson 9 5.9%					
Eiseley 7 4.2%	Eiseley 2 1.2%					
Martin 4 5.2%	Martin 10 13.0					
Walt 9 3.7%	Walt 20 8.3%					
LIBA 4 2.6%	LIBA 6 3.9%					
TOTAL 44 4.1% (\$35 per year ¹)	TOTAL 63 5.8% (\$60 per year)					
\$70 million						
ABLE 5 11.6%						
Gere 51 20.5%						
Anderson 6 3.9%						
Eiseley 39 23.6%						
Martin 21 27.3%						
Walt 85 35.3%						
LIBA 41 26.8%						
TOTAL 248 22.9% (\$41 per year ¹)						

1 - Based on \$100,000 assessed value